



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/665,566	09/22/2003	Yosuke Tajika	03180.0334	6157

22852 7590 01/24/2007  
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER  
LLP  
901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW  
WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413

EXAMINER

PATEL, RAMESH B

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2121

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	01/24/2007	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/665,566

Applicant(s)

TAJIKA, YOSUKE

Examiner

Ramesh B. Patel

Art Unit

2121

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 September 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 23 September 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8/25/2004 & 12/21/2006.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

### DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-15 are presented for examination.
2. The claims and only the claims form the metes and bounds of the invention. "Office personnel are to give claims their broadest reasonable interpretation in light of the supporting disclosure. In re Morris, 127 F.3d 1048, 1054-55, 44 USPQ2d 1023, 1027-28 (Fed. Cir. 1997). Limitations appearing in the specification but not recited in the claim are not read into the claim. In re Prater, 415 F.2d 1393, 1404-05, 162 USPQ 541, 550-551 (CCPA 1969)" (MPEP p 2100-8, c 2, I 45-48; p 2100-9, c 1, I 1-4). The Examiner has full latitude to interpret each claim in the broadest reasonable sense. The Examiner will reference prior art using terminology familiar to one of ordinary skill in the art. Such an approach is broad in concept and can be either explicit or implicit in meaning.

### **Priority**

3. Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d). The certified copy has been filed in the application.

**Information Disclosure Statement**

4. The information disclosure statements (IDS) submitted on 9/22/2003 and 12/21/2006 are in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statements being considered by the examiner.

**Specification**

5. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because the abstract contains the terms "A remote controlling device that is not dependent on the control target device is made such..." examiner is sure what it meant by remote controlling device in not dependent on the control target device", remote controlling device are connected to the target device wirelessly to each other for communicating for any action or function for controlling the remote devices and/or the control target device. Also, examiner is not sure whether the terms "remote controlling device" should be "remote control device" or "remote controlling device" as to a remote controller or a device(s) being controlled by the remote control. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

6. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The

Art Unit: 2121

abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

7. Applicant is reminded of the proper content of an abstract of the disclosure.

A patent abstract is a concise statement of the technical disclosure of the patent and should include that which is new in the art to which the invention pertains. If the patent is of a basic nature, the entire technical disclosure may be new in the art, and the abstract should be directed to the entire disclosure. If the patent is in the nature of an improvement in an old apparatus, process, product, or composition, the abstract should include the technical disclosure of the improvement. In certain patents, particularly those for compounds and compositions, wherein the process for making and/or the use thereof are not obvious, the abstract should set forth a process for making and/or use thereof. If the new technical disclosure involves modifications or alternatives, the abstract should mention by way of example the preferred modification or alternative.

The abstract should not refer to purported merits or speculative applications of the invention and should not compare the invention with the prior art.

Where applicable, the abstract should include the following:

- (1) if a machine or apparatus, its organization and operation;
- (2) if an article, its method of making;
- (3) if a chemical compound, its identity and use;
- (4) if a mixture, its ingredients;
- (5) if a process, the steps.

Extensive mechanical and design details of apparatus should not be given.

**Claim Objections**

8. Claim 15 is objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 15, includes the terms "electronics device" should be "electronic device" to correct minor informality.

Appropriate correction is required.

**Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112**

9. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1 and 7-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential structural cooperative relationships of elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the necessary structural connections. See MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted structural cooperative relationships are: the limitation(s) "a control information containing a plurality of operation instructions and control commands respectively corresponding to the operation instructions..."; examiner is not sure how and/or why control commands are respectively corresponded to the plurality of

operation instructions; there is not a proper structural relationships between these limitations, it appears to be missing some information and/or it is not clear to interpret the structural relationship between the limitations.

Dependent claims, which are not particularly rejected, are rejected based on the rejected base claim.

**Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101**

10. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

11. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 7 is not limited to tangible embodiments. In view of Applicant's disclosure, specification paragraph [0107] on page 8 of US Pat. Pub. 20040127997, the medium is not limited to tangible embodiments, instead being defined as including both tangible embodiments (e.g., a software package can be a computer program product which employs a storage medium including stored computer code) and intangible embodiments (e.g., The storage medium may include, but is not limited to, any type of conventional floppy disks, optical disks, CD-ROMs, magneto-optical disks, ROMs, RAMs, EPROMs, EEPROMs, magnetic or optical cards, **or any other suitable media for storing electronic instructions**). As such, the claim is not limited to statutory subject matter and is therefore non-statutory. A claimed program

Art Unit: 2121

instructions or data structures or program code not claimed as embodied in computer readable media are descriptive material per se and are not statutory. To overcome this type of 101 rejection the claims need to be amended to include only physical computer media and not a transmission media or other intangible or non-functional media.

12. Claims 1-15 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph and/or 101 and or objection, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

13. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: the prior art of the record particularly fails to teach or fairly suggest in combination with the other elements and features of the claimed invention regarding claims 1-6, a control device for controlling a control target device by using a control command, comprising: a recognition unit configured to recognize an operation instruction entered by a user and a command search unit configured to carry out a search to check whether the operation instruction recognized by the recognition unit is contained in the control information stored by the control information storage unit and output a control command corresponding to the operation instruction when the operation instruction is contained in the control information; regarding claim 7, a computer program product, comprising: a first to fifth computer product code and their respective functions for causing a computer to acquire a control information and for controlling a control target device and regarding to claims 8-15, a control system which



Art Unit: 2121

comprising; a control target device for carrying out a prescribed operation according to a received control command, having a first control information storing unit configured to store a control information containing plurality of operation instructions and control commands and a control device for controlling the control target device by using a control command having a second control information storing unit configured to store the control information in a rewritable form and a recognition unit configured to recognize an operation instruction entered by a user and a command search unit configured to carry out a search to check whether the operation instruction recognized by the recognition unit is contained in the control information stored by the control information storage unit and output a control command corresponding to the operation instruction when the operation instruction is contained in the control information.


14. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Art Unit: 2121

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ramesh B. Patel whose telephone number is 571-272-3688. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th; 6:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Anthony Knight can be reached on 571-272-3687. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
Ramesh B. Patel  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2121  
1/22/07

rp